

and all those Boy Scout words, which would be great around the campfire but lousy in politics."

And then he says,

The Republican Party, refashioned by Mr. Gingrich and his right-wing cronies, no longer has that problem. Since winning control of Congress in 1994, it has consistently pursued a mean-spirited extremist agenda and is now determined to turn the self-inflicted wounds of the President into an even larger majority.

Now, he says and this is what the American people should be thinking about:

Try to imagine the implications of a bigger, more powerful, more aggressive, more right-wing regime of Republicans in Congress. This is a party that is not content with trying to roll back abortion rights. It is fighting on several fronts against contraception. Just last week the Republican leadership in the House, under pressure from the right, killed a measure that would have required Federal health plans that cover prescription drugs to cover the cost of contraceptives. No one seemed to think it was crazy to have abortion foes opposing a measure that would reduce the need for abortions. They could not grasp that.

He goes on to talk about the party that fought a meat inspection system designed to protect the people from the deadly E. coli. Members from my State, where we had children die, lingering deaths of E. coli infection voted against increasing meat inspections. I know we do not want big government. But there are some things the government should do. It should inspect the meat. Children should not die in fast food restaurants or in children's hospitals after a month of hospitalization of something contracted in a fast food restaurant. There is no question.

He also says,

Of course, you can't expect much from the Republicans because their whip denounced the Environmental Protection Agency as the Gestapo of the government.

The Gestapo of the government. This is the kind of talk we get.

He goes on to talk about the leadership's ethics and talks about a whole bunch of things, including one of the leadership who comes out on the floor and delivers tobacco checks on the floor to Members of Congress. I mean, this is right here on the floor. We talk about why we need campaign finance reform. We got Members and the leadership of the majority party walking around handing out checks right here on the floor, while we are fighting about whether we should do something about tobacco. There is lots more but the people ought to be worried about what is going on in this Congress.

G.O.P. COVER STORY

Throughout Thursday's impeachment debate in the House you could hear the uncharacteristically low-keyed voice of the G.O.P.'s chief inquisitor.

"The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for three minutes," Newt Gingrich would say. Or he would rap his Speaker's gavel for quiet and ask, oh so formally and respectfully, "Does the gentleman move the previous question?"

Every now and then he would smile hideously, reminding us that hypocrisy is as

abundant in Washington as fertilizer on the farm.

It was, frankly, chilling. Newt Gingrich presiding over the possible impeachment of a Democratic President, even one as spectacularly vulnerable as Bill Clinton, is insane.

This is the same Newt Gingrich who several years ago told a group of young Republicans: "I think one of the great problems we have in the Republican Party is that we don't encourage you to be nasty. We encourage you to be neat, obedient and loyal and faithful and all those Boy Scout words, which would be great around the campfire but are lousy in politics."

The Republican Party, refashioned by Mr. Gingrich and his right-wing cronies, no longer has that problem. Since winning control of Congress in 1994, it has consistently pursued a mean-spirited extremist agenda and is now determined to turn the self-inflicted wounds of Bill Clinton into an even larger majority.

Try to imagine the implications of a bigger, more powerful, more aggressive, more right-wing regime of Republicans in Congress.

This is a party that is not content with trying to roll back abortion rights. It is fighting on several fronts against contraception. Just last week the Republican leadership in the House, under pressure from the right, killed a measure that would have required Federal health plans that cover prescription drugs to cover the cost of contraceptives. No one seemed to think it was crazy to have abortion foes opposing a measure that would reduce the need for abortions.

This is a party that tried to eliminate Federal nutrition standards for school meals and fought hard against a meat inspection system designed to protect the public from the deadly E. coli bacteria.

It's a party that attacked Medicare and Medicaid and went out of its way to trash the environment. Clean air? Clean water? Forget about it. Representative Tom DeLay of Texas, the majority whip and a sharp critic of Mr. Clinton, denounced the Environmental Protection Agency as the "Gestapo of the Government."

You want ethics? Pull the clips on Mr. Gingrich and learn how not to behave. Or check out John Boehner of Ohio, chairman of the House Republican Conference. I wrote a column in 1996 describing how he took money from tobacco lobbyists and handed it out to certain of his colleagues on the floor of the House, while the House was in session.

These are men who couldn't find the high road if they approached it by parachute.

There is no doubt that Bill Clinton brought his problems on himself. He destroyed his own Presidency. But there are consequences to be paid if the Republicans are allowed to feast too ravenously on the political spoils.

Democrats have already lost the opportunity to control the campaign season with discussions of such issues as the rights of patients in the era of managed care, the need to move boldly to rebuild the public school system, the concerns of working Americans in a chaotic economic environment and the outlook for Social Security.

Having been handed the gift of Monica Lewinsky, the Republicans are running with her. She conceals their real agenda. If they can parlay the Monica madness into substantially increased majorities in the House and Senate, they can renew their conservative assault on government and their subversion of the interests of ordinary working Americans and the poor.

Keep in mind that this is a party that crafted extraordinary tax breaks for billionaires while claiming the sky would fall if the minimum wage was raised to \$5.25 an hour.

Bill Clinton and the Democrats fended off the most extreme aspects of the so-called Re-

publican revolution of the mid-90s'. Now Mr. Clinton has given the right-wingers the opportunity to take care of their unfinished business. Only the voters stand in the way.

COMMENTS FROM A CONSTITUENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, I would just say, I put in 70, 80 hours a week and nobody has ever accused me of killing children because Republicans are withholding money from the FDA for E. coli. It is a shameful remark for the last speaker to say that. We gave the power to Secretary Glickman to use whatever resources are necessary to the Department of Agriculture to fight E. coli. To be accused of killing children. No wonder a constituent of mine Beatrice Mock wrote a letter to me, I picked it up this morning. She said:

Dear Congressman, after listening to the pros and cons of the last few weeks, I decided to call your office and voice my objection to what is happening in Washington. Somehow this quotation came to mind and seems to sum up much of what should be said. If as it seems our Congressmen, Senators and President are only interested in the power their offices gives them and not what is best for the country, only in getting reelected time after time, then we are doomed.

She went through and stated that the numerous members of her family that have fought in every war except World War I started with the Spanish-American war. She said, "So you see, I have a vested interest in seeing our leaders held accountable for their actions." She enclosed a quotation from, I think a State Senator, William Boroh, found in an old Bible that belonged to her family. Here is the quotation:

The salvation of our Republic depends on the people, the strength of might and clarity of purpose of the average voter. Democracies tend to make moral cowards of public men. Unless people rise to the task and demand high ideals and truly American standards, then there is no hope from State legislators, from spineless Congresses or listening to officials.

She concluded,

This quotation should be spoken again and again. Much of your tasks are or may be unpleasant. However, your constituents are expecting you to find your voice and to speak your conscience.

Mr. Speaker, that letter says it all. Values and character do not depend on polls. Let me quote something. Harry Truman once commented on the importance of polls to leadership, with the following insight.

□ 1545

I wonder how far Moses would have gone if he had taken a poll in Egypt. What would Jesus Christ have preached if he had taken a poll in Israel? Where would the Reformation have gone if Martin Luther had taken a poll? It is not the polls or the public opinion of the moment that counts. It is right and wrong, and leadership, men with fortitude, honesty and a belief in right that makes epics in the history of the world.

Some things are right, and some things are wrong, and these do not depend upon the philosophy of the day.

There was an article that appeared in the Washington Times about 4 years ago about Daimion Osby, Fort Worth teenager by the name of Daimion Osby. He was 18 years old, was charged with shooting and killing two other young men, Willie Brooks and Marcus Brooks. They were his cousins. Mr. Osby's lawyers came up with a pathetically cynical defense. The youth committed fratricide because he suffered from, quote, "urban survival syndrome," they argued. In other words, he blew away his unarmed cousins because he thought they were out to get him.

This is not accepting responsibility for one's actions, and irony of all ironies, as I came into the office this morning and saw this letter from my constituent, I picked up Dic DeVos' book on rediscovering American values at home, and it fell open to the chapter on accountability. It is exactly what my client was calling for in her letter when she said:

"So you see I have a vested interest in seeing our leaders held accountable for their actions."

And Dick DeVos says:

Some like to blame others for what goes wrong in their lives. Others blame God. When we hold ourselves accountable, we accept the blame for wrong choices. Accountability is part of my faith. I believe that we are all accountable to God for the choices we make. Thankfully God is forgiving, but we must acknowledge our mistakes before him. Accountability depends on honesty and humility as well as fairness and courage. This means simply recognizing and accepting responsibility and the consequences for past mistakes and for the state in which we find ourselves. Individuals can receive rewards for accomplishments and victories.

Mr. Speaker, it is accountability for one's actions for which my client has written this letter and which I am glad to share with this body today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BRADY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BECERRA addressed the House. His remarks will appear in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DEMOCRATS' APPROACH BEST SOLVES THE PROBLEMS OF EDUCATION IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, time and time again, Americans have said that they want Congress to deal with the real issues, the issues that affect their daily lives and that affect the future of their young people. Education is such an issue.

We are here this weekend debating, and some say fighting, over the question of education and America's future.

We on the Democratic side have a clear proposition. We believe that we need to invest more money in public education.

As my colleagues know, recently we got a wake-up call of sorts. In a battery of international tests, American students lagged behind their foreign counterparts. Moreover, as we talk about the global economy and the 21st century, what we realize is that we need more technical training for our students in order to compete in the global economy.

That is why education has become the issue of the day. That is why the debate rages.

What I would like to do is talk about the two perspectives and two approaches to solving the problem of education in this country.

On the Republican side they have advocated basically two things:

One, a voucher program. They want to use the District of Columbia as a laboratory in which to take money out of public schools, put it in private schools and say this new competition from the private school sector will create better schools. That is clearly erroneous because they do not put enough money into a voucher program to make it work. Private schools do not have to take all types of students; public schools do. We do not need to put money into a voucher program for private schools because 9 out of 10 American students will always end up in the public school system, and we need to make an investment in the public school system.

Next, they come up with the notion that they like to call dollars to the schools, to the classroom. What I call it is dollars from the classroom because what their proposal does by creating a block grant is to cut over \$2 billion from public education and then tell us we are actually putting more dollars in the classroom.

Now we have to understand their premise is that too much money is being spent on bureaucracy. That is simply not true. The fact of the matter is only 2 percent of the entire Federal budget in education for the Department of Education goes to Federal administration. The rest goes to your State, your county and your city to administer education programs. So do not let them come up and suggest, well, there is too much bureaucracy. It is certainly not Federal bureaucracy. We do have that 2 percent, though, and that is used to monitor Federal programs to make sure the money is not wasted at the local level. So they want to take this money out of the Federal sector and take, basically cut it out, of the budget. That is what their dollars from the classroom does.

Let me tell my colleagues some of the things that they cut. They cut educational technology challenge funds. They cut the Eisenhower Teacher Training Program. They cut school to work. Why would you cut a school to work program that is helping students make the transition? They cut the

After School Learning Program. Why would you cut a program that helps students after school hours when they are most likely to get in trouble? It does not seem to make a lot of sense.

Now they talk about their Dollars to the Classroom. I did a little research, and from my State of Maryland we will lose \$10 million as a result of the Republican approach. So I do not call it Dollars to the Classroom; it is clearly for the State of Maryland and, for most other States, dollars from the classroom.

Now let us turn to the Democratic approach. We believe we need to do a couple of fundamental things to improve education in America. First, we need to hire a hundred thousand new teachers for the elementary school, grades 1 to 3, to reduce class size. That is what we are fighting about over the weekend, whether we need to make that investment, because more teachers mean smaller classes, and smaller classes mean a better learning environment.

Second, we want to invest in modernizing our schools. Over a third of our schools need major repairs. That is to say that they need heating systems, air-conditioning systems, that their boiler systems do not work very well. Over half of our schools have major environmental problems that we need to confront and are not prepared to adapt to the Internet. They cannot be wired to the Internet.

So what we have is a situation in which outmoded, crumbling schools cannot deliver a quality education, and again we on the Democratic side believe we need to make an investment in public education to modernize our school system.

We also have a problem of overcrowded schools. The President came to my school district, we visited a school. The school was only 5 years old, but yet it had 6 trailers outside to teach kids. The trailers do not have air-conditioning, the trailers do not have restrooms. You do not have a proper educational environment.

So here we are. We are confronting the 21st century. We know that we lag behind our international counterparts, and we know we need to modernize our schools. I think the Democratic approach best solves the problem of education in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CUBIN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BOYD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BOYD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)